

## Message Text

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00290 01 OF 02 081421Z  
ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-01  
INR-07 IO-13 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01  
PM-04 PRS-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00 NSC-05  
ERDE-00 /089 W  
-----081445Z 115362 /41

P 081342Z JUN 77  
FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA  
TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 2179  
SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY  
INFO USMISSION NATO PRIORITY  
AMEMBASSY BONN PRIORITY  
AMEMBASSY LONDON PRIORITY  
USNMR SHAPE PRIORITY  
USCINCEUR PRIORITY

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 2 MBFR VIENNA 0290

FROM MBFR REPRESENTATIVE

E.O. 11652: GDS  
TAGS: PARM, NATO  
SUBJ: MBFR: INFORMAL SESSION WITH EASTERN REPRESENTATIVES OF  
JUNE 7, 1977

1. BEGIN SUMMARY: IN THE JUNE 7, 1977 INFORMAL SESSION OF THE VIENNA TALKS, THE ALLIES WERE REPRESENTED BY THE FRG REP, NETHERLANDS REP AND THE US REP, AND THE EAST BY SOVIET REPS TARASOV AND SHUSTOV, POLISH REP DABROWA AND GDR REP OESER. MILITARY ADVISORS ALSO PARTICIPATED.

2. THE SESSION WAS A RELATIVELY BRIEF ONE. EASTERN REPS RESPONDED TO CANADIAN REPS CRITICISM IN MAY 24 INFORMAL SESSION OF THE EASTERN PROPOSAL FOR A SO-CALLED GENERAL COMMITMENT BY WESTERN EUROPEAN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS AND CANADA FOR THEIR STAGE II REDUCTIONS. THEY STATED THAT THESE WESTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00290 01 OF 02 081421Z

WERE NOT READY TO UNDERTAKE A REAL COMMITMENT BUT ONLY A COMMITMENT TO BEGIN SECOND STAGE NEGOTIATIONS. EASTERN REPS SAID THAT IF THE WEST HAD OTHER IDEAS ON TIMING OF STAGE 2 REDUCTIONS BY THESE PARTICIPANTS OR A DIFFERENT METHOD OF INDICATING THE SCOPE OF THESE REDUCTIONS OTHER THAN THE EQUAL PERCENTAGE METHOD, EAST WOULD BE READY TO CONSIDER THESE VIEWS. THE EAST ANSWERED SOME WESTERN QUESTIONS CONCERNING WARSAW

PACT FORCES AND ASKED ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS ABOUT THE WESTERN APPROACH TO INCLUSIONS AND EXCLUSIONS.

3. WESTERN REPS RESPONDED TO CRITICISM BY WARSAW PACT REPS OF RECENT NATO DECISIONS TO STRENGTHEN NATO FORCES, POINTING OUT THAT THE EAST HAD BEEN INCREASING ITS NUMERICAL SUPERIORITY IN MAJOR ARMAMENTS IN THE REDUCTION AREA SINCE THE OUTSET OF THE VIENNA TALKS. WESTERN REPS STRESSED THE NEED TO TAKE INTO ACCOUNT THE IMPACT OF GEOGRAPHY ON REDUCTION AND LIMITATION OBLIGATIONS TO BE UNDERTAKEN BY PARTICIPANTS IN DIFFERENT GEOGRAPHIC SITUATIONS AND EXPLAINED HOW THE WESTERN PROPOSAL FOR A SUBCEILING ON THE SOVIET UNION RESTED IN PART ON GEOGRAPHIC FACTORS. WESTERN REPS ANSWERED EASTERN QUESTIONS ON WESTERN DATA FROM PREVIOUS SESSION AND ASKED FURTHER WESTERN QUESTIONS ABOUT EASTERN DATA.

4. NETHERLANDS REP LED OFF BY NOTING EASTERN REPS HAD CRITICIZED RECENT NATO DECISIONS REGARDING THE STRENGTHENING AND MODERNIZATION OF NATO FORCES. AS NATO COMMUNIQUES HAD MADE CLEAR, THE NATO COUNTRIES HAD TAKEN THESE DECISIONS IN REACTION TO A SUBSTANTIAL AND CONTINUING BUILD-UP OF SOVIET AND OTHER WARSAW PACT FORCES BOTH INSIDE THE REDUCTION AREA AND OUTSIDE IT, NOTABLY ON THE TERRITORY OF THE USSR. INSIDE THE REDUCTION AREA, BOTH SIDES HAD BEEN CARRYING OUT MODERNIZATION PROGRAMS DURING THE NEGOTIATIONS. BUT WARSAW PACT PARTICIPANTS HAD ALSO INCREASED THE TOTAL NUMBER OF THEIR MAJOR ARMAMENTS, INCREASING EXISTING EASTERN NUMERICAL SUPERIORITIES IN MOST TYPES OF ARMAMENTS. THUS, THE NATO DECISION TO STRENGTHEN WESTERN ARMED FORCES HAD BEEN NECESSARY TO MAINTAIN NATO'S DEFENSE CAPABILITY IN THE

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00290 01 OF 02 081421Z

FACE OF SUSTAINED INCREASES IN WARSAW PACT MILITARY CAPABILITIES. THESE NECESSARY WESTERN DECISIONS DID NOT DETRACT FROM WESTERN DETERMINATION TO PURSUE THE VIENNA TALKS TO A SUCCESSFUL OUTCOME.

5. THE POLISH REP CLAIMED THAT THE OFFER BY THE WESTERN EUROPEAN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS AND CANADA TO REDUCE THEIR FORCES TO A COMMON COLLECTIVE CEILING IN PHASE II DID NOT AMOUNT TO A FIRM COMMITMENT TO REDUCE IN THE SECOND PHASE, BUT ONLY A COMMITMENT TO PARTICIPATE IN PHASE II NEGOTIATIONS WHICH COULD LAST INDEFINITELY IF ANY PARTICIPANT IN THEM DID NOT WANT THEM TO HAVE A SPECIFIC RESULT. IT WAS NECESSARY FOR THESE WESTERN PARTICIPANTS TO SPECIFY THE TIMING AND VOLUME OF THEIR STAGE 2 REDUCTIONS. AS REGARDS SCOPE, IT WAS NOT CLEAR FROM THE WESTERN POSITION WHETHER WESTERN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS INTENDED TO CARRY OUT REDUCTIONS PROPORTIONATELY TO THE SIZE OF THEIR FORCES. IF EASTERN IDEAS ON TIMING OF PHASE II REDUCTIONS WERE NOT SATISFACTORY TO THE WEST, THE WEST SHOULD GIVE ITS OWN VIEWS ON THIS TOPIC.

SECRET

NNN

SECRET

PAGE 01 MBFR V 00290 02 OF 02 081440Z

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 ACDE-00 ERDA-05 CIAE-00 H-01

INR-07 IO-13 L-03 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01

PM-04 PRS-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00 NSC-05

ERDE-00 /089 W

-----081453Z 115657 /41

P 081342Z JUN 77

FM USDEL MBFR VIENNA

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 2180

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO USMISSION NATO PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY BONN PRIORITY

AMEMBASSY LONDON PRIORITY

USNMR SHAPE PRIORITY

USCINCEUR PRIORITY

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 2 MBFR VIENNA 0290

FROM MBFR REPRESENTATIVE

6. THE FRG REP POINTED OUT THAT PARTICIPANTS COULD NOT IGNORE THE IMPACT OF GEOGRAPHY ON THE OBLIGATIONS THEY WOULD ASSUME UNDER A FORCE REDUCTION AGREEMENT. GEOGRAPHY HAD PLACED PARTICIPANTS IN THE TALKS IN DIFFERENT SITUATIONS. THESE DIFFERENCES Affected THE IMPACT OF OBLIGATIONS ON THEIR SECURITY. THE FACTS THAT THE SOVIET UNION HAD ONE OF THE LARGEST MILITARY FORCES IN THE WORLD, THAT ITS TERRITORY WAS DIRECTLY ADJACENT TO THE REDUCTION AREA, AND THAT A REDUCTION AGREEMENT WOULD NOT RESULT IN ANY NUMERICAL LIMITATION ON THESE LARGE FORCES ON SOVIET TERRITORIES WERE PARTICULARLY RELEVANT TO THE SECURITY OF WESTERN PARTICIPANTS. GIVEN THESE FACTS, IT WAS FULLY JUSTIFIED THAT THE WESTERN POSITION CALLING FOR COLLECTIVE CEILINGS ON THE MILITARY MANPOWER ON BOTH SIDES ALSO FORESAW A SUBCEILING ON SOVIET MILITARY MANPOWER IN THE REDUCTION AREA. THE EASTERN POSITION TOOK NO ACCOUNT OF THE IMPACT OF GEOGRAPHY. ANY AGREEMENT MUST DO SO IF IT WAS NOT

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 02 MBFR V 00290 02 OF 02 081440Z

TO DIMINISH THE SECURITY OF THE WEST.

7. CONTINUING THE THEME OF STAGE II COMMITMENTS RAISED BY THE POLISH REP, THE GDR REP CLAIMED THAT THE EAST WANTED THE WESTERN EUROPEAN DIRECT PARTICIPANTS AND CANADA TO UNDERTAKE ONLY GENERAL COMMITMENTS ON THE SCOPE AND TIMING OF THEIR STAGE II REDUCTIONS. HE SAID THAT, ALTHOUGH THE EASTERN APPROACH CALLED FOR COMMITMENTS BASED ON EQUAL PERCENTAGE REDUCTIONS, THE EAST WAS READY TO CONSIDER OTHER SOLUTIONS AS REGARDS SCOPE. ASKED BY THE FRG REP WHETHER THIS MEANT A NUMERICAL COMMITMENT, THE GDR REP SAID IT WAS UP TO THE WEST TO MAKE PROPOSALS OF ITS OWN ON THIS TOPIC. HE SAID THE EAST WAS NOT PREPARED TO AGREE TO STAGE I SOVIET WITHDRAWALS WITHOUT GUARANTEES BY THE WESTERN EUROPEAN PARTICIPANTS AND CANADA FOR THEIR STAGE II REDUCTIONS.

8. THE US REP ANSWERED THE TWO QUESTIONS ASKED BY THE EAST IN THE MAY 31 SESSION CONCERNING PERSONNEL ASSIGNED TO THE PROTECTION OF ENTERPRISES AND INSTITUTIONS IN NATO COUNTRIES AND ACTIVE DUTY MILITARY PERSONNEL ON THE WESTERN SIDE WHO WERE NOT REQUIRED TO WEAR A MILITARY UNIFORM WHILE ACTUALLY PERFORMING THEIR DUTIES. HE ASKED WHETHER THE EAST HAD PERSONNEL OTHER THAN PERSONNEL OF THE POLISH TERRITORIAL FORCES WHO WERE CONSCRIPTED BUT PERFORMED WORK FOR THE NATIONAL ECONOMY AND WHETHER THE EAST HAD PERSONNEL IN MILITARY UNIFORM PERFORMING FUNCTIONS ON A PART-TIME BASIS FOR THE WARSAW PACT ARMED FORCES.

9. TARASOV COMPLAINED THAT WESTERN REPS HAD THUS-FAR PROVIDED NO ANSWER TO HIS QUESTION IN THE APRIL 4 INFORMAL SESSION AS TO HOW THE GEOGRAPHIC FACTORS REFERRED TO BY WESTERN REPS WAS REFLECTED IN THE WESTERN NEGOTIATING APPROACH. WITH RESPECT TO THE FRG REP'S REMARKS ABOUT A SUBCEILING ON THE SOVIETS, TARASOV SAID THE EAST REJECTED THIS WESTERN CONCEPT AND THAT THE SAME APPROACH SHOULD BE TAKEN BY ALL PARTICIPANTS IN THIS AS IN OTHER ISSUES. TARASOV ANSWERED WESTERN QUESTIONS ON WARSAW PACT FORCES RAISED IN THE MAY 31 SESSION. HE ASKED QUESTIONS ABOUT WESTERN COUNTING PRACTICES INCLUDING A QUESTION ABOUT WHICH

SECRET

SECRET

PAGE 03 MBFR V 00290 02 OF 02 081440Z

EASTERN PERSONNEL THE WEST HAD EXCLUDED FROM ITS ESTIMATES OF WARSAW PACT FORCES.

END SUMMARY.RESOR

SECRET

NNN



## Message Attributes

**Automatic Decaptoning:** X  
**Capture Date:** 01-Jan-1994 12:00:00 am  
**Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Current Classification:** UNCLASSIFIED  
**Concepts:** MEETINGS, DIPLOMATIC REPRESENTATIONS, MUTUAL FORCE REDUCTIONS  
**Control Number:** n/a  
**Copy:** SINGLE  
**Sent Date:** 08-Jun-1977 12:00:00 am  
**Decaption Date:** 01-Jan-1960 12:00:00 am  
**Decaption Note:**  
**Disposition Action:** RELEASED  
**Disposition Approved on Date:**  
**Disposition Case Number:** n/a  
**Disposition Comment:** 25 YEAR REVIEW  
**Disposition Date:** 22 May 2009  
**Disposition Event:**  
**Disposition History:** n/a  
**Disposition Reason:**  
**Disposition Remarks:**  
**Document Number:** 1977MBFRV00290  
**Document Source:** CORE  
**Document Unique ID:** 00  
**Drafter:** n/a  
**Enclosure:** n/a  
**Executive Order:** GS  
**Errors:** N/A  
**Expiration:**  
**Film Number:** D770204-0428  
**Format:** TEL  
**From:** MBFR VIENNA  
**Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Image Path:**  
**ISecure:** 1  
**Legacy Key:** link1977/newtext/t19770679/aaaacqxg.tel  
**Line Count:** 215  
**Litigation Code IDs:**  
**Litigation Codes:**  
**Litigation History:**  
**Locator:** TEXT ON-LINE, ON MICROFILM  
**Message ID:** 248ba182-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc  
**Office:** ACTION ACDA  
**Original Classification:** SECRET  
**Original Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Original Previous Classification:** n/a  
**Original Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Page Count:** 4  
**Previous Channel Indicators:** n/a  
**Previous Classification:** SECRET  
**Previous Handling Restrictions:** n/a  
**Reference:** n/a  
**Retention:** 0  
**Review Action:** RELEASED, APPROVED  
**Review Content Flags:**  
**Review Date:** 24-Nov-2004 12:00:00 am  
**Review Event:**  
**Review Exemptions:** n/a  
**Review Media Identifier:**  
**Review Release Date:** n/a  
**Review Release Event:** n/a  
**Review Transfer Date:**  
**Review Withdrawn Fields:** n/a  
**SAS ID:** 2231258  
**Secure:** OPEN  
**Status:** NATIVE  
**Subject:** MBFR: INFORMAL SESSION WITH EASTERN REPRESENTATIVES OF JUNE 7, 1977  
**TAGS:** PARM, NATO  
**To:** STATE 'DOD  
**Type:** TE  
**vdkvgwkey:** odbc://SAS/SAS.dbo.SAS\_Docs/248ba182-c288-dd11-92da-001cc4696bcc  
**Review Markings:**  
Margaret P. Grafeld  
Declassified/Released  
US Department of State  
EO Systematic Review  
22 May 2009  
**Markings:** Margaret P. Grafeld Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 22 May 2009